DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 827 JC 790 098

TITLE Coordination and Governance in Colorado Postsecondary Education.
INSTITUTION Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education, Denver.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 10p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; *Board of Education Role; Community Colleges; *Educational Coordination; *Governance; Governing Boards; *Junior Colleges; State Agencies; *State Boards of Education; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Colorado

ABSTRACT

In support of a legislative examination of the governance, role, and mission of Colorado's institutions of higher education, this paper presents the position of the Colorado State Board for Community Colleges on postsecondary coordination and governance. Of the several approaches toward statewide coordination or governance that have been attempted in various states, Colorado selected the coordination approach in 1965 when the General Assembly created the Colorado Commission on Higher Education as a planning and coordinating agency. Since then the governance structure in postsecondary education has changed, but the Commission remains active in student financial aid and outreach instruction. Another significant event occurred in 1967 when the State Board for Community College and Occupational Education and the state system for community colleges (wherein each institution has a College Council serving as an interface between the State Board and the local community) were established. The advantages of this system have been revealed in numerous studies. They lie in its increased flexibility, adaptability, and effectiveness; in the ability of the coordinating agencies to act as an umbrella under which the various constituencies can be placed; and in the provision of a balanced view of local and state needs and resources. An appendix contains role and mission statements from Colorado's community and junior colleges. (AYC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165827

COORDINATION AND GOVERNANCE

IN

COLORADO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Terrence Tollefson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 790 098

COLORADO STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

COLORADO STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

COORDINATION AND GOVERNANCE IN COLORADO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Preliminary materials issued by the Legislative Council in July of this year indicated that the Interim Legislative Committee on Higher Education, as a part of its deliberations, would examine the "governance, role, and mission of Colorado's institutions of higher education." Additionally, these issues are currently under review in the development of a state plan for Colorado postsecondary education. This paper has been prepared for purposes of presenting the Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education's position on the complex subject of postsecondary education coordination and governance. The issues of role and mission have previously been addressed by the State Board, and its views related thereto are provided in Attachment A appended to this paper.

To properly discuss the issue of coordination/governance, it is first necessary to define the differences between them. "A statewide governing board replaces all other governing boards. The single board controls internal affairs of the institutions and acts as their advocate to the public and to the State. On the other hand, coordinating boards are superimposed over the governing boards of the various public colleges and universities to coordinate their activities in responding to State priorities of educational needs and resourse allocation among the several institutions."[1]

Several approaches directed towards the statewide coordination or governance of postsecondary education have been attempted in the states over the years. Statewide coordination has been the most popular and generally accepted method, perhaps in recognition of the fact that a single governing board represents a too simplistic approach to a very complex problem, and because leading State universities generally have been unable to control statewide coordinating agencies in practice

whereas they can dominate the system under a single board.[2]

Colorado selected the coordination approach in 1965 when the General Assembly created the Colorado Commission on Higher Education as a planning and coordinating agency. The Commission's enabling authority stated that:

> "The purposes of this article are to make opportunities for post high school education as available as possible in Colorado; to avoid needless duplication of facilities and programs in institutions of higher education; to achieve simplicity of state administrative procedures pertaining to higher education; to effect the best utilization of available resources so as to achieve an adequate level of higher education in the most economic manner; and to continue to recognize the constitutional and statutory responsibilities of duly constituted governing boards of institutions of higher education in Colorado." (C.R.S. 1973, 23-1-101)

Since the Commission origination, the governance structure in Colorado postsecondary education has changed substantially. The Commission from time to time has been delegated certain governing responsibilities and remains active in the areas of student financial aid and outreach instruction. Concerning the governing

boards themselves, perhaps the most significant event occurred in 1967 when the General Assembly created the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education and the State system of community junior colleges, with each State system institution having a College Council serving as an interface between the State Board and the local community. This structure remains intact today.

The State Board believes that the advantages of a coordinating agency for a state's postsecondary educational system far outweigh those associated with a statewide governing board. This belief has been shared by other Colorado groups who have considered this matter in recent years. This is not to say that problems do not and will not arise in the coordination process, because a structure does not exist which can be considered a panacea in this regard. However, it is the position of the State Board that statewide coordination is the best of the available alternatives.

The advantages associated with statewide coordination closely parallel the

experience of the corporate world, as the respective environments are quite similar in terms of the complexities involved. "Coordinating structures have proven more flexible, more adaptive, and more effective in planning than pyramidal hierarchies, the vastly increased numbers of decisions that must be made in both spheres require myriad professional specialists and a variety of levels and places for long-range and operational decisionmaking. No evidence exists that single boards will in fact meet expectations."[3]

Perhaps the greatest advantage of coordination is the ability to act as an umbrella under which the various postsecondary educational constituencies may be placed. Thus, private colleges and universities and proprietary vocational and technical schools can be involved in the development of the State's postsecondary system. The coordinating agency therefore can be truly representative of all segments of postsecondary education. Additionally, the coordination structure can be maintained and accompanied by a more efficient management and more effective utilization of State resources.[4]

The Colorado Committee on Government Efficiency and Economy in its March, 1969 Report on the Department of Higher Education endorsed the principle of coordination for Colorado postsecondary education and the notion of a governing board for Colorado's state system community junior colleges and vocational education programs. Among the advantages cited in this report are "the provision of a balanced view of the needs of the State and the resources of the State, a more effective structure for dealing with conflict, and the exercise of progressive leadership in the State's higher educational affairs."[5]

The Legislative Council, in a report to the Colorado General Assembly entitled "Organization of State Government," noted that the coordination structure was the most viable tool for recognizing and emphasizing the total needs of higher education and channeling and coordinating the goals of each institution in an efficient and economical manner. The report further noted that a single governing board would be incompatible with the concept of broadly based lay

governance of higher education, and that successful management of each school would probably be made quite difficult.[6]

Finally, in 1974, eight task forces, comprised of individuals from a variety of backgrounds both inside and outside of formal education, were organized by the Commission on Higher Education to study several postsecondary education issues. Several of these task forces addressed the issue of coordination and governance of Colorado postsecondary education and endorsed the principle of coordination. Additionally, "the Governance Task Force strongly reinforced the coordination principle by recommending the avoidance of the extremes of a single governing board and the lack of a centralized focus accompanying the establishment of a governing board for each institution."[7] It should also be noted that both the Governance Task Force and the 1969 Legislative Council report recommended the continuation of the State Board as the governing board for Colorado's state system community junior colleges and vocational education programs.

In summary, this paper has provided a brief review of the major considerations regarding the coordination and governance of a postsecondary educational system. Additionally, the State Board's views on this subject were stated. To conclude, it is the policy of the State Board that:

1. A statewide coordinating agency, as opposed to a single governing board, remains the most philosophically sound and operationally viable alternative for Colorado postsecondary education; and
2. The governance structure in the two-year sector is the most appropriate and effective approach for insuring the delivery of needed educational services to a Colorado population heretofore unserved by higher education and a growing and increasingly complex Colorado economy.

NOTES

1. Lyman A. Glenny, et. al., Coordinating Higher Education, Guidelines for Statewide Systems (Berkeley, Ca.: The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California, 1971), pp. 1-2.

2. Ibid., p. 3.

3. Ibid., p. 4.

4. Ibid., pp. 5-7.

5. Colorado Committee on Government Efficuency and Economy, Department of Higher Education (Denver, Colo.: The Committee, March 1969), pp.22-23.

6. Colorado Legislative Council, Organization of State Government, Research Publication No. 149, (Denver, Colo.: The Council, December 1969), pp. xiv-xv.

7. Colorado Commission on Higher Education, Planning for the 80's (Denver, Colo.: The Commission, September 1977), p. 1.6.

11/28/77

ATTACHMENT A

ROLE AND MISSION STATEMENTS

COLORADO'S COMMUNTIY JUNIOR COLLEGES

excerpted from:

"RESPONSE TO THE PRELIMINARY ROLE STATEMENT

FOR COLORADO PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS"

COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES (REVISED)

The two-year community junior colleges should be locally-oriented, "open-door" institutions--that is, they admit all high school graduates and other students with similar qualifications, and they provide opportunities appropriate to the needs of all persons beyond 16 years of age. The definition of the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education of an "open-door" institution is accepted. That is, any citizen of post-high school age or older may enter one of the institutions and be provided with educational opportunity that lies within his range of interest and ability. An open-door philosophy maintains the opportunity for students to qualify for admission regardless of past academic performance, as long as it can be demonstrated that the student can profit from such instruction. This guarantees the "right to try" regardless of age, or past achievement patterns. At the same time, the "open-door" does not imply the continuation of a student through the impairing of quality or standards of the educational program.

Ordinarily community junior colleges offer comprehensive programs, including occupational education for job preparation, retraining and upgrading; general and pre-professional education of the first two years of the college or university; and a broad range of programs of personal and vocational education for adults. There may also be established under certain circumstances within the two-year college system "Area Vocational-Technical Schools," planned in appropriate relationship with the comprehensive community junior colleges, secondary schools or other institution.

The Commission like the Task Force, believes that the two-year community and technical college sector, as one of its functions, must provide a foundation for the progressive development of a total post-secondary system that will make it possible for Colorado to achieve both <u>quality</u> in terms of program excellence in all of higher education, and <u>quantity</u> in terms of the needs of our people for a wide range of educational opportunity.

Consistent with the role statement outlined above, it is recommended that the comprehensive community junior colleges have primary responsibility for offering degree and certificate programs of two years or less in Colorado, and the the SBCCOE take the leadership in arranging for sharing of resources with the other sectors to assure that the role of the community junior college is being fulfilled in all areas of the State. Colleges designated as area vocational schools, as well as those in close proximity to area vocational schools, have a special coordinative responsibility.

It is also recommended that the comprehensive community junior colleges assume, as a part of their role, the provision of necessary remedial and preparatory work as a service to all sectors of higher educaiton. This implies close cooperation with other higher education institutions, as well as with area vocational schools. The role of the community junior college sector is also assumed to include planning and cooperation with the Department of Education to implement and perpetuate GED programs within the community college institutions for studetns 16 years of age or older, and for those persons confined to penal institutions or in other situations where the need arises.

A campus for a comprehensive community college is defined as extending beyond the boundaries containing the physical plant, and encompasses the entire service area of the institution. It is recommended that resources be provided at a level which will encourage delivery of educational services at locations throughout the service area.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 3 1979

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES